

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated April 25, 2006 has been received and reviewed by the applicant. Claims 1 and 16 are now in the application and stand finally rejected.

Remaining claims 1 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In response to this rejection, the remaining claims have been amended to more clearly recite that principal light entering the image sensor comprises "image forming light which passes through the absorber once" and "remaining reflective light which passes through the absorber three times". Thus, the two "lights" are now clearly distinguished. Support for this language is found in the specification at page 1, lines 14-17 and page 3, lines 1-3. It should be noted that the function of the absorber is to substantially prevent effects on imaging by the reflective light. This fact is evident from the specification and is supported by the various prior art references cited by Examiner. Thus, there is no basis for Examiner's suggestion that reflective light that passes through the absorber "three times" is "image forming light".

Remaining claims 1 and 16, as understood, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takanashi et al. (UK Patent Application GB 2131599). Of these claims, only claims 1 and 16 remain.


Claims 1 and 16 have been amended to incorporate the limitation of claims 6 and 20 that the absorber is "disposed in a color filter". This limitation is not disclosed in Takanashi et al. wherein the absorber A is separated from the color filter 4 by a transparent face plate 1. Accordingly, these remaining claims are now believed to be allowable over Takanashi et al.

Claims 1 and 16, as understood, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Obama et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0197947) and by Yonetani et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0165694) and by Tsuyuki (U.S. Patent 6,985,170). Original claims 6 and 20 were not rejected on these references, presumably because they did not disclose the limitation of the absorber being "disposed in a color filter". This limitation has been incorporated in remaining claims 1 and 16 and thus these claims are now believed to be allowable of these references.

Claims 2 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either one of Takanashi et al. or Yonetani et al. or Obama et al. or Tsuyuki in view of Saito et al. (U.S. Patent 5,685,919). This rejection is moot since these claims have been cancelled.

In light of the foregoing amendments and for the reasons set forth above, it is believed that the application has now been placed in condition for allowance which action is respectfully solicited

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 36,390

Peyton C. Watkins/lam  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: 585-477-8282  
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.